



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Se

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,185	07/10/2001	Yasser alSafadi	US010318	7534
24737	7590	06/03/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			USTARIS, JOSEPH G	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2611	10	
DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/902,185	ALSAFADI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph G Ustaris	2611

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED **FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.** Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may **only** be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-19.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____



✓ **JAYATRAI**
PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendments made to claim 18 change the scope of the claim thereby requiring a new search. Also see attached.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11 May 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Humpleman doesn't perform the step of determining a reference information model for use with the original generic EPG or "content-related information". However, Humpleman suggests that if the original generic EPG already has an existing format then the home network would build the home HTML network program guide without converting the original generic EPG into the standard program format or "reference information model", whereas the home network would convert the original generic EPG if there was no existing format or otherwise "determining a reference information model for use with the content-related information" (See Humpleman column 23 lines 1-17).

Applicant further argues that Humpleman processes the HTML program guide using the home devices and not by an electronic program guide. However, Humpleman discloses that each browser based home device contains a session manager that performs the functions of an electronic program guide. The session manager within the DTV gives the user access the home devices to get more information, such as the HTML network program guide. The session manger then processes the HTML file to be displayed by the browser based home device. The session manager is also responsible for other operations as well (See Fig. 10 and column 6 lines 55-60, column 9 lines 35-55, column 17 lines 35-45, and column 18 lines 60-67).

Applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Therefore, respectfully, the rejections made on claims 1-19 still stand.


JGU
May 20, 2004


HAI TRAN
PATENT EXAMINER